

Boundary charges in gauge theories: using Stokes theorem in the bulk

Glenn Barnich*

Physique Théorique et Mathématique,
Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Campus Plaine C.P. 231, B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgium

Abstract

Boundary charges in gauge theories (like the ADM mass in general relativity) can be understood as integrals of linear conserved $n-2$ forms of the free theory obtained by linearization around the background. These forms are associated one-to-one to reducibility parameters of this background (like the time-like Killing vector of Minkowski space-time). In this paper, closed $n-2$ forms in the full interacting theory are constructed in terms of a one parameter family of solutions to the full equations of motion that admits a reducibility parameter. These forms thus allow one to apply Stokes theorem without bulk contributions and, provided appropriate fall-off conditions are satisfied, they reduce asymptotically near the boundary to the conserved $n-2$ forms of the linearized theory. As an application, the first law of black hole mechanics in asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-times is derived.

*Research Associate of the Belgium National Fund for Scientific Research.

1 Introduction

Both Lagrangian [1, 2, 3] and Hamiltonian [4, 5] approaches involve in some way the idea that it is the linearized theory around the background that determines the asymptotically conserved $n - 2$ forms used for the construction of boundary charges in gauge theories in n space-time dimensions. Recent results from variational calculus [6] (see [7] for a review and also [8, 9]) corroborate this point of view:

- when restricted to solutions of the equations of motion, equivalence classes of closed, local, $n - 2$ forms up to exact, local, $n - 2$ forms correspond one-to-one to non trivial reducibility parameters; in this context, reducibility parameters are possibly field dependent gauge parameters such that the associated gauge transformations vanish on solutions of the equations of motion; such parameters are trivial if they vanish themselves on solutions of the equations of motion;
- in standard interacting gauge theories like general relativity or semi-simple Yang-Mills theories in space-time dimensions strictly higher than 2, there are no non trivial reducibility parameters and thus no non trivial conserved $n - 2$ forms; in other words, every local $n - 2$ form that is closed on solutions of the equations of motion is given by the exterior derivative of a local $n - 3$ form on solutions of the equations of motion;
- in linear gauge theories however, reducibility parameters may very well exist; for instance in general relativity linearized around some background, particular reducibility parameters are given by the Killing vectors of the background; furthermore, for the flat background in space-time dimensions strictly higher than 2, they can be shown to be the only non trivial ones [10].

In [11], the one-to-one correspondence has been extended to (suitable equivalence classes of) asymptotically conserved $n - 2$ forms on the one hand and asymptotic reducibility parameters on the other hand. Furthermore, for given reducibility parameters, the asymptotically conserved $n - 2$ forms have been explicitly constructed out of the linearized equations of motion and of the gauge transformations evaluated at the background. That the associated charges have all the standard properties like time independence or independence of the form or position of the closed $n - 2$ dimensional hypersurface used in their definition is a direct consequence of on-shell closure and of Stokes theorem. By construction however, the $n - 2$ forms are only closed near the boundary, when evaluated for asymptotic solutions, i.e., deviations from the background that satisfy the boundary conditions and the linearized field equations to leading order. Hence, the application of Stokes theorem to relate the boundary charges to integrals over surfaces deep in the bulk will in general involve bulk contributions.

From the point of view of the full interacting theory, different expressions for asymptotically conserved $n - 2$ forms are considered as equivalent to the

linear $n - 2$ forms discussed above, if asymptotically near the boundary, all non linear terms in the field deviations from the background vanish and if the linear terms belong to the same equivalence class (and thus define the same boundary charges) as the $n - 2$ forms of the linearized theory. This leaves of course a lot of freedom in the definition of these forms, and allows one to show for instance that the expressions derived in [12, 1, 2, 8] for energy-momentum and angular momentum in asymptotically flat general relativity are all equivalent (see also e.g. [13] for a recent discussion).

Motivated by the work of Wald and Iyer [14, 15, 16] (see also e.g. [17]) on the formulation of the first law of black hole mechanics in terms of Noether charge, we will construct in this work $n - 2$ forms of the full interacting theory that are closed in a region of the bulk, provided that

- the $n - 2$ form is constructed using a one parameter family of solutions to the full equations of motion valid in the region of the bulk where one wants to use Stokes theorem;
- the exact reducibility parameters of the background are simultaneously exact reducibility parameters of the one parameter family of solutions to the full equations of motion.

As a result, for these one parameter family of solutions, the boundary charges are related to the integrals of the $n - 2$ forms over surfaces deep in the bulk. Furthermore, if the Taylor expansions in the parameter of the $n - 2$ forms satisfy suitable fall-off conditions near the boundary, these forms reduce to the $n - 2$ forms of the linearized theory discussed previously and thus correctly describe the boundary charges.

In the next section, we briefly review, in the context of the linearized theory that is supposed to describe the full theory asymptotically near the boundary, the expression for the linear conserved $n - 2$ forms associated to the reducibility parameters of the background. Section 3 contains the main result on how the conserved $n - 2$ forms of the linearized theory should be modified so that Stokes theorem can be used without bulk contributions. In section 4, the theorem of section 3 is applied to the well known cases of Yang-Mills theory and Einstein gravity with cosmological constant. It is shown explicitly how the improved $n - 2$ forms can be used to express conservation of total energy. As an application, a derivation of the first law of black hole mechanics for asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-times is presented. In the conclusion, the results that have been obtained are discussed from the point of view of the original derivation of the first law and comments on the relation to other approaches are made.

2 Construction of the linear conserved $n-2$ forms of the free theory

Let $R_\alpha^i[\phi]$ denote a generating set of gauge transformations [18], with associated gauge symmetries $\delta_f \phi^i = R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha)$, where the parameters f^α are local functions,

i.e., they may depend on x^μ , the fields ϕ^i and a finite number of their derivatives.

For example, in Einstein-Maxwell theory with cosmological constant Λ , described by the action,

$$S = \int d^n x \frac{\sqrt{|g|}}{16\pi} [R - 2\Lambda - F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}], \quad (1)$$

the fields ϕ^i correspond to $g_{\mu\nu}, A_\mu$, the metric and the electromagnetic gauge potentials respectively; the gauge parameters f^α correspond to ξ^μ, λ , the parameters of an infinitesimal diffeomorphism and an infinitesimal $U(1)$ gauge transformation respectively, while $\delta_f \phi^i = R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha)$ corresponds to

$$\delta_{\xi, \lambda} g_{\mu\nu} = L_\xi g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

$$\delta_{\xi, \lambda} A_\mu = L_\xi A_\mu + \partial_\mu \lambda, \quad (3)$$

with L_ξ denoting the Lie derivative.

For all $Q_i d^n x$ with Q_i local functions, we define the current $n-1$ form $S_\alpha^i[\phi](Q_i, f^\alpha) = S_\alpha^{i\mu}(Q_i, f^\alpha)(d^{n-1}x)_\mu$ through

$$Q_i R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha) = f^\alpha R_\alpha^{+i}(Q_i) d^n x + d_H S_\alpha^i(Q_i, f^\alpha). \quad (4)$$

In this equation, R_α^{+i} denote the associated generating set of Noether operators, obtained from the gauge symmetries by the integrations by parts that move the derivatives from the gauge parameters to the Q_i . The operator $d_H = dx^\mu \partial_\mu$, with ∂_μ the total derivative with respect to x^μ , is the horizontal differential and $(d^{n-p}x)_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} = \frac{1}{p!(n-p)!} \epsilon_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} dx^{\mu_{p+1}} \dots dx^{\mu_n}$ with $\epsilon_{0 \dots n-1} = 1$. For example, if

$$Q_i R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha) = Q_i R_\alpha^i f^\alpha + Q_i R_\alpha^{i\mu} \partial_\mu f^\alpha, \quad (5)$$

then

$$f^\alpha R_\alpha^{+i}(Q_i) = f^\alpha R_\alpha^i Q_i - f^\alpha \partial_\mu [R_\alpha^{i\mu} Q_i], \quad (6)$$

$$S_\alpha^{i\mu}(Q_i, f^\alpha) = Q_i R_\alpha^{i\mu} f^\alpha. \quad (7)$$

The defining property of the Noether operators are the Noether identities

$$R_\alpha^{+i} \left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i} \right) = 0. \quad (8)$$

In the Einstein-Maxwell example considered above, these identities correspond to the contracted Bianchi identities $D_\mu (G^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g^{\mu\nu}) = 0$ and $D_\mu D_\nu F^{\nu\mu} = 0$.

When the Q_i are replaced with the left hand side of the Euler-Lagrange equations of motion in (4), one gets, because of the Noether identities (8),

$$\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i} R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha) = d_H S_f, \quad S_f \equiv S_\alpha^i \left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i}, f^\alpha \right). \quad (9)$$

In other words, S_f is a weakly vanishing representative for the Noether current $n-1$ form associated to the gauge symmetry $\delta_f \phi^i = R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha)$.

In the Einstein-Maxwell example, S_f is explicitly given by

$$S_{\xi,\lambda} = \frac{\sqrt{|g|}}{16\pi} [(-G^{\mu\nu} - \Lambda g^{\mu\nu} + 8\pi T_{em}^{\mu\nu} + 4D_\nu F^{\nu\mu}(\xi^\rho A_\rho + \lambda))(d^{n-1}x)_\mu], \quad (10)$$

where the electromagnetic energy-momentum tensor is

$$T_{em}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\delta L^{em}}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} [F^{\mu\alpha} F^\nu{}_\alpha - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} F^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta}]. \quad (11)$$

Let $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$ be a background solution to the Euler-Lagrange equations of motion and $\phi^i = \bar{\phi}^i(x) + \varphi^i$. We denote by $\frac{\delta L^{\text{free}}}{\delta \varphi^i}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ the equations of motion linearized around $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$, obtained from the quadratic piece of the Lagrangian in an expansion according to φ . If $f^{0\alpha} = f^\alpha[x, \bar{\phi}]$, the linearization around $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$ of (9) gives

$$\frac{\delta L^{\text{free}}}{\delta \varphi^i} R_\alpha^{0i}(f^{0\alpha}) = d_H s_{f^0}, \quad s_{f^0}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}] = S_\alpha^{0i}(\frac{\delta L^{\text{free}}}{\delta \varphi^i}, f^{0\alpha}), \quad (12)$$

where $S_\alpha^{0i} = S_\alpha^i[\bar{\phi}(x)]$. For field independent parameters¹ $\tilde{f}^\alpha$ that satisfy

$$R_\alpha^{0i}(\tilde{f}^\alpha) = 0, \quad (13)$$

equation (12) implies that

$$d_H s_{\tilde{f}} = 0. \quad (14)$$

In the Einstein-Maxwell example, solutions to (13) are given by the Killing vectors of the background metric, $L_{\tilde{\xi}} \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} = 0$, which satisfy in addition $L_{\tilde{\xi}} \bar{A}_\mu + \partial_\mu \tilde{\lambda} = 0$ for some gauge parameter $\tilde{\lambda}$.

In the case of trivial topology, equation (14) implies that $s_{\tilde{f}} = d_H \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}$, for some $n-2$ form $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$. Provided the equations of motion $\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i}$ and the gauge transformations $R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha)$ are local, in the sense that they depend only on a finite number of derivatives of the fields, the $n-2$ form $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ can be constructed to be local as well, in the sense that it depends (linearly) on the φ^i and a finite number of their derivatives, and on a finite number of derivatives of the background $\bar{\phi}^i$. How to explicitly construct $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}$ out of $s_{\tilde{f}}$ has been explained in many references, see e.g. [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. In the general relativity literature for instance, an algorithm has been given in [29]. In fact, the whole theory of "black hole entropy from Noether charge" [14, 15, 17, 16] relies crucially on this algorithm. Whereas in these references, the algorithm is used in terms of arbitrary gauge parameters, we will use the explicit formula

¹The general case of field dependent gauge parameters $\tilde{f}^\alpha$ that satisfy $R_\alpha^{0i}(f^\alpha) \approx^{free} 0$, where $\approx^{free}$ means an equality that holds on solutions of the equations of motion of the linearized theory, is treated in section 3 of [11]. It can be shown that, when evaluated on solutions of the linearized theory, the expression of the $n-2$ forms constructed below is still valid in the more general case.

for the "contracting homotopy" involving higher order Euler operators due to Anderson [30, 31], in terms of the fields φ^i of the linearized theory below, and in terms of the fields ϕ^i of the full theory in the next section. Indeed, in the case of trivial topology, for local forms ω^p of degree p strictly lower than n that vanish when the φ^i and their derivatives are set to zero, there exists an operator $\rho_{H,\varphi}$ such that

$$d_H(\rho_{H,\varphi}^p \omega^p) + \rho_{H,\varphi}^{p+1}(d_H \omega^p) = \omega^p. \quad (15)$$

It follows that the $n-2$ form of the linearized theory defined by

$$\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}} = \rho_{H,\varphi}^{n-1} s_{\tilde{f}}, \quad (16)$$

is closed when the linearized equations of motion hold:

$$d_H \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}} = s_{\tilde{f}} \approx^{\text{free}} 0. \quad (17)$$

The explicit expression for $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}$ is

$$\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}] = \sum_{k=0} \frac{k+1}{k+2} \partial_{\mu_1} \dots \partial_{\mu_k} \left[\varphi^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k \rho}^j} \frac{\partial s_{\tilde{f}}}{\partial x^\rho} \right], \quad (18)$$

with the understanding that the first term in the sum does not contain an index μ and no total derivative. Furthermore, the notation $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\rho}$ stands for the contraction of a form with the vector $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\rho}$, while the higher order Euler operators $\frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k \rho}^j}$ are constructed out of the symmetrized partial derivatives $\frac{\partial^S}{\partial \varphi_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k}^j}$. The detailed combinatorial factors involved in the definitions of these operators can be found in [31] or in appendix A of [11]. Note however that the definition of $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ used here differs by an overall minus sign from the one used in [11].

The $n-2$ forms $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ have been explicitly computed in [11] for Yang-Mills theory and Einstein gravity with cosmological constant and the results of [2, 3] and [8] have been recovered. From the point of view of [2, 3] the contracting homotopy $\rho_{H,\varphi}^p$ provides a systematic way of converting "volume integrals to surface integrals".

In the next section, we construct an $n-2$ form in the full theory that, under suitable assumptions, is closed in the bulk and reduces asymptotically to the $n-2$ form (18) of the linearized theory if appropriate fall-off conditions are satisfied.

3 Construction of the closed n-2 forms of the full theory

The most general form of the homotopy formula for d_H (given in [31], chapter 4, pages 119-122) allows one to interpolate between a form evaluated at two

different field configurations by using a (not necessarily straight) path that connects these configurations: if $\phi_s^i(x)$, $s \in [0, 1]$ is a one parameter family of field configurations and $\varphi_s^i(x) = \frac{d\phi_s^i(x)}{ds}$, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} S_f[\phi_1(x)] - S_f[\phi_0(x)] &= \int_0^1 ds \frac{d}{ds} (S_f[\phi_s]) \\ &= \int_0^1 ds \left(\sum_{k=0} \partial_{\mu_1} \dots \partial_{\mu_k} \varphi_s^i \left[\frac{\partial^S}{\partial \phi_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k}^i} S_f \right] [\phi_s] \right) \\ &= d_H \rho_H^{n-1} S_f + \rho_H^n d_H S_f, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where for a p form $\omega^p[\phi]$,

$$\rho_H^p \omega^p = \int_0^1 ds I_{\varphi_s(x)}^p(\omega^p)[\phi_s(x)], \quad (20)$$

with

$$I_{\varphi_s}^p(\omega^p) = \sum_{k=0} \frac{k+1}{n-p+k+1} \partial_{\mu_1} \dots \partial_{\mu_k} \left[\varphi_s^i(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_k}^i} \frac{\partial \omega^p}{\partial dx^\rho} \right]. \quad (21)$$

If we define

$$K_f = \rho_H^{n-1} S_f, \quad (22)$$

it follows using (9) that

$$d_H K_f = -\rho_H^n \left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i} R_\alpha^i(f^\alpha) d^n x \right) + S_f[\phi_1(x)] - S_f[\phi_0(x)], \quad (23)$$

for an arbitrary configuration $\phi_s^i(x)$. Using the explicit expression of ρ_H^n , one can then show:

Theorem 1. *For a given solution $\phi^i(x)$ of the full equations of motion, the $n-2$ form $K_{\tilde{f}}$, defined in (22), is closed in the bulk,*

$$d_H K_{\tilde{f}} = 0, \quad (24)$$

provided

- a one parameter family $\phi_s^i(x)$ of solutions to the full equations of motion interpolating between $\phi^i(x)$ and the background solution $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$ is used,

$$\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i}[\phi_s(x)] = 0, \forall s \in [0, 1], \quad (25)$$

- the gauge parameters $f^\alpha = \tilde{f}^\alpha$ are reducibility parameters for this interpolating solution,

$$R_\alpha^i[\phi_s(x)](\tilde{f}^\alpha) = 0, \forall s \in [0, 1]. \quad (26)$$

The proof of the theorem is given in the appendix.

The $n-2$ form $K_{\tilde{f}}$ depends in general on the path γ in the space of solutions chosen to interpolate between $\bar{\phi}(x)$ and $\phi(x)$, but not on the parameterization chosen for this path². This justifies the following notation:

$$K_{\tilde{f}} = \int_{\gamma} I_{d_V \phi}^{n-1}(S_{\tilde{f}})[\phi], \quad (27)$$

where $d_V \phi^i$ stands for an infinitesimal variation of the fields. More precisely, $K_{\tilde{f}}$ is the integral along γ of the vertical 1 form and horizontal $n-2$ form in the variational bicomplex [30, 31].

Given appropriate fall-off conditions and an analytic expansion in s , the $n-2$ form $K_{\tilde{f}}$ coincides asymptotically near the boundary with the linear $n-2$ form $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}$ discussed in the previous section: indeed, if $\phi_s(x) = \bar{\phi}^i(x) + s\varphi^i(x) + s^2\varphi_2^i(x) + \dots$ and the fall-off conditions are such that, in an expansion according to s , only the term independent of s in $I_{\varphi_s(x)}(S_{\tilde{f}})[\phi_s(x)]$ contributes because all the other terms fall off too fast near the boundary, we have

$$K_{\tilde{f}} \longrightarrow I_{\varphi(x)}(S_{\tilde{f}})[\bar{\phi}(x)] \quad (28)$$

In the appendix, it is shown that this expression agrees with expression (18) of the linearized theory.

This reasoning can also be turned around to see how $K_{\tilde{f}}$ can be constructed from $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ of the linearized theory : because $s_{\tilde{f}} = (d_V S_{\tilde{f}})[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$, where d_V denotes a variation of the fields ϕ^i and their derivatives and the argument $[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ means that the variations of the fields are substituted by φ^i and the fields by the background solution $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$, $I_{\varphi_s(x)}^{n-1}(S_{\tilde{f}})[\phi_s(x)]$ is given by the right hand side of (18), where $\varphi^i(x), \bar{\phi}^i(x)$ are replaced by $\varphi_s^i(x), \phi_s^i(x)$. We have thus shown the following corollary to theorem 1:

Corollary 1. *The closed forms $K_{\tilde{f}}$ associated to a one parameter family of solutions $\phi_s^i(x)$ with reducibility parameters $\tilde{f}^\alpha$ can be obtained from the conserved $n-2$ forms $\tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi; \bar{\phi}]$ of the linearized theory defined in (18) by substituting the background for the one parameter family of solutions $\phi^s(x)$, by substituting the field deviations φ by $\varphi^s(x) = \frac{d\phi^s(x)}{ds}$ and by integrating over the parameter:*

$$K_{\tilde{f}} = \int_0^1 ds \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\varphi^s; \phi^s]. \quad (29)$$

Again, if γ is the path in the space of solutions interpolating between $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$ and $\phi^i(x)$, reparameterization invariance allows one to write

$$K_{\tilde{f}} = \int_{\gamma} \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[d_V \phi; \phi]. \quad (30)$$

²The author wants to thank J. Zanelli for drawing his attention to this point.

Consider now the path $\gamma + \delta\gamma$ where $\delta\gamma$ is the “straight path” between the solution $\phi^i(x)$ and the infinitesimally close solution $\phi^i(x) + \delta\phi^i(x)$. If we define $\delta K_{\tilde{f}}$ to be the variation of $K_{\tilde{f}}$ when evaluated on $\gamma + \delta\gamma$ and on γ , it follows that

$$\delta K_{\tilde{f}} \equiv \int_{\gamma + \delta\gamma} \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[d_V \phi; \phi] - \int_{\gamma} \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[d_V \phi; \phi] = \tilde{k}_{\tilde{f}}[\delta\phi(x); \phi(x)]. \quad (31)$$

4 Standard applications

The $n - 2$ forms of the linearized theory given by (18) have been explicitly computed, up to a conventional overall sign difference, in [11] section 6 for Yang-Mills theory and general relativity. The corresponding $n - 2$ forms in the full theory constructed using (29) are briefly discussed in the next two subsections.

4.1 Yang-Mills theory

In the Yang-Mills case, the $n - 2$ forms of the linearized theory agree with the ones found in [3] if $\bar{D}_\mu \tilde{f} = 0$ is taken into account. Here $\bar{D}_\mu$ is the background covariant derivative and $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^a T_a$ are non abelian gauge parameters. In the full non linear theory, application of (29) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\tilde{f}} &= (d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \int_0^1 ds \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{f} f_s^{\mu\nu}) \\ &= (d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \operatorname{Tr} \left(\tilde{f} (F^{\mu\nu}(x) - \bar{F}^{\mu\nu}(x)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$D_\mu[A_s(x)]\tilde{f} = 0 \quad (33)$$

has been taken into account and $f_s^{\mu\nu}(x) = D^\mu[A_s(x)]a_s^\nu(x) - D^\nu[A_s(x)]a_s^\mu(x)$ with $a_\mu^s = \frac{dA_\mu^s}{ds}$. Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\tilde{f}} &= (d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \int_0^1 ds \left(\partial^\mu \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{f} a_s^\nu) - \partial^\nu \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{f} a_s^\mu) \right) \\ &= 2(d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu \operatorname{Tr} \left(\tilde{f} (A^\nu(x) - \bar{A}^\nu(x)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In this case, the result does not depend on the path $A_\mu^s(x)$ in the space of solutions but only on the end points $\bar{A}_\mu(x)$ and $A_\mu(x)$.

4.2 General relativity with cosmological constant

In the case of gravity with Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{16\pi} \sqrt{-g} (R - 2\Lambda),$$

direct application of (18) gives $n - 2$ forms in the linearized theory that agree with those of [2]. According to (29), the $n - 2$ forms in the non linear theory are obtained by replacing the background $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ by a one parameter family of solutions $g_{\mu\nu}^s$ and the metric deviations $h_{\mu\nu}$ by $h_{\mu\nu}^s = \frac{dg_{\mu\nu}^s}{ds}$ and integration the resulting expression over s . Dropping for notational simplicity the s dependence, one finds

$$K_{\tilde{\xi}} = \frac{1}{16\pi}(d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \int_0^1 ds \sqrt{-g} \left(\tilde{\xi}^\nu D^\mu h + \tilde{\xi}^\mu D_\sigma h^{\sigma\mu} + \tilde{\xi}_\sigma D^\nu h^{\sigma\mu} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2} h D^\nu \tilde{\xi}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} h^{\mu\sigma} D_\sigma \tilde{\xi}^\nu + \frac{1}{2} h^{\nu\sigma} D^\mu \tilde{\xi}_\sigma - (\mu \longleftrightarrow \nu) \right) \quad (35)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{16\pi}(d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \int_0^1 ds \sqrt{-g} \left(\tilde{\xi}_\rho D_\sigma H^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} H^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \tilde{\xi}_\sigma \right), \quad (36)$$

where $H^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}[h; g]$ has the symmetries of the Riemann tensor:

$$H^{\mu\alpha\nu\beta}[h; g] = -\hat{h}^{\alpha\beta} g^{\mu\nu} - \hat{h}^{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} + \hat{h}^{\alpha\nu} g^{\mu\beta} + \hat{h}^{\mu\beta} g^{\alpha\nu}, \quad (37)$$

$$\hat{h}_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} h. \quad (38)$$

In these expressions, it is understood that $g_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}^s(x)$ is the metric used to define the covariant derivative and, together with its inverse, to lower and raise the indices, with $h = h_\mu^\mu$. In [11], it has been pointed out that using the Killing equation $\bar{D}_\mu \tilde{\xi}_\mu + \bar{D}_\nu \tilde{\xi}_\nu = 0$, the corresponding expression in the linearized theory agrees with the simplified expression given in equation (11) of [8]. Accordingly, in the full theory, using the Killing equation

$$D_\mu \tilde{\xi}_\nu + D_\nu \tilde{\xi}_\mu = 0, \quad (39)$$

an equivalent expression is

$$K_{\tilde{\xi}} = \frac{1}{16\pi}(d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \int_0^1 ds \sqrt{-g} \left(h^{\mu\sigma} D_\sigma \tilde{\xi}^\nu - \tilde{\xi}_\sigma D^\mu h^{\nu\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} h D^\mu \tilde{\xi}^\nu \right. \\ \left. + \tilde{\xi}^\mu (D_\sigma h^{\nu\sigma} - D^\nu h) - (\mu \longleftrightarrow \nu) \right). \quad (40)$$

As pointed out in [8], their expression (11) in the linearized theory agrees with $d_V Q - \tilde{\xi} \cdot \Theta$, where d_V denotes a field variation and Q and Θ are defined in equations (61) respectively (63) of [15]. Using this observation in the context of the full theory, one finds that $K_{\tilde{\xi}}$ can be decomposed into a piece involving the Komar integrands depending only on the end points of the path and a path dependent piece that is proportional to the undifferentiated Killing vector:

$$K_{\tilde{\xi}} = \int_0^1 ds \left(-\frac{1}{16\pi} \frac{d}{ds} K_{\tilde{\xi}}^K[g_s(x)] - \tilde{\xi}^\nu \frac{d}{dx^\nu} \Theta[g_s(x), h_s(x)] \right) \\ = -\frac{1}{16\pi} K_{\tilde{\xi}}^K[g(x)] + \frac{1}{16\pi} K_{\tilde{\xi}}^K[\bar{g}(x)] - \int_0^1 ds \tilde{\xi}^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial dx^\nu} \Theta[g_s(x), h_s(x)], \quad (41)$$

where

$$K_{\tilde{\xi}}^K[g] = (d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g} \left(D^\mu \tilde{\xi}^\nu - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right) \quad (42)$$

is the Komar integrand and

$$\Theta[g, h] = \frac{1}{16\pi} (d^{n-1}x)_\mu \sqrt{-g} \left(D_\sigma h^{\mu\sigma} - D^\mu h \right). \quad (43)$$

4.3 The first law of black hole mechanics

As an application, we consider 4 dimensional asymptotically anti-de Sitter, stationary and axisymmetric black hole space times, such as for example the (uncharged) Kerr anti-de Sitter black holes [32] (see also e.g. [33, 34] for recent discussions of the first law in this context). In this particular case, the path that interpolates between anti-de Sitter space $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ and a given Kerr anti-de Sitter black hole $g_{\mu\nu}(x) = g_{\mu\nu}^1(x)$ with fixed M and a can for instance be chosen to be $g_{\mu\nu}^s(x) = g^{\mu\nu}(sM, sa)$. (Note that this interpolation only needs to be valid in the region of space-time where one wants to apply Stokes theorem.) The total energy difference $\mathcal{E}$ between the background and the given solution is

$$\mathcal{E} = \oint_{S^\infty} K_k, \quad (44)$$

where S^∞ is the 2 sphere at infinity given in Boyer-Lindquist type coordinates by $t = t_0, r = R \rightarrow \infty$, with t_0, R constant, and the stationary Killing vector field k in these coordinates can (for instance) be chosen to be $k = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$.

As a consequence of Stokes theorem and the fact that $dK_k = 0$, conservation of total energy reduces to

$$\mathcal{E} = \oint_S K_k, \quad (45)$$

where S is another closed 2 dimensional surface such that S^∞ and S are the boundaries of some 3 dimensional volume Σ . In particular, time independence of $\mathcal{E}$ follows by choosing S to be the 2 sphere at infinity for some other time $t = t_1$.

Let $S = H$ be the intersection of Σ with the event horizon $\mathcal{H}^+$, $k = \xi - \Omega_H m$, where m is the axial Killing vector field given in Boyer-Lindquist type coordinates by $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$, ξ is the null generator of the horizon associated to the solution $g_{\mu\nu}(x) = g_{\mu\nu}^1(x)$ and Ω_H its constant angular velocity. Using expression (41) and the fact that m is tangent to S^∞ , a Smarr type formula can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= \oint_{S^\infty} [K_\xi - \Omega_H K_m] \\ &= \oint_H K_\xi + \Omega_H \mathcal{J} \\ &= \frac{\kappa}{8\pi} A_H + \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_H K_\xi^K[\bar{g}(x)] - \oint_H \int_0^1 ds \, \xi^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial dx^\nu} \Theta + \Omega_H \mathcal{J}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

with A_H the area of the horizon, κ its surface gravity and

$$\mathcal{J} = - \oint_{S^\infty} K_m = \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_{S^\infty} \left(K_m^K[g(x)] - K_m^K[\bar{g}(x)] \right) \quad (47)$$

the total angular momentum.

In order to derive the first law of black hole mechanics in this context, we will follow closely the reasoning of [14, 15] in the asymptotically flat case. The same steps as in the previous paragraph will now be applied to δK_k given in (31), with H chosen to be the bifurcation surface B of the Killing horizon of the solution $g_{\mu\nu}(x) = g_{\mu\nu}^1(x)$. If

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{J} &= - \oint_{S^\infty} \tilde{k}_m[\delta g(x); g(x)] \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_{S^\infty} \delta K_m^K \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_{S^\infty} (d^{n-2}x)_{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g} \left(\tilde{\xi}_\sigma D^\mu \delta g^{\nu\sigma} - \delta g^{\mu\sigma} D_\sigma \tilde{\xi}^\nu + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \delta g D^\mu \tilde{\xi}^\nu - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

with $\delta g = \delta g_\mu^\mu$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{E} &\equiv \oint_{S^\infty} \tilde{k}_k[\delta g(x); g(x)] \\ &= \oint_{S^\infty} \left(\tilde{k}_\xi[\delta g(x); g(x)] - \Omega_H \tilde{k}_m[\delta g(x); g(x)] \right) \\ &= \oint_B \tilde{k}_\xi[\delta g(x); g(x)] + \Omega_H \delta \mathcal{J} \\ &= \frac{\kappa}{8\pi} \delta A_H + \Omega_H \delta \mathcal{J}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The last line follows if one can show that $\oint_B \tilde{k}_\xi[\delta g(x); g(x)] = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi} \delta A_H$. Because ξ vanishes on the bifurcation surface B , one sees by comparing expressions (40) and (41) (without integral over s and $h_{\mu\nu}$ replaced by $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$) that only the variation of the Komar integrand can contribute, $\oint_B \tilde{k}_\xi[\delta g(x); g(x)] = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_B \delta K_\xi^K$. That this last expression reduces to $\frac{\kappa}{8\pi} \delta A_H$ can be shown by following for instance the proof of theorem 6.1 of [15].

5 Conclusion

In standard interacting gauge theories like semi-simple Yang-Mills theory or general relativity in space-time dimensions strictly higher than 2, all local $n-2$ forms that are closed on-shell are trivial in the sense that they are given, on-shell, by the exterior derivative of local $n-3$ forms. In the linearized theory around the background, however, non trivial on-shell closed $n-2$ forms do exist and

they are in one-to-one correspondence with non trivial reducibility parameters of the background.

In the case where there exists a path in the space of solutions that connects the background to the solution of interest and that admits reducibility parameters, we have constructed in this paper closed $n - 2$ forms of the full interacting theory, that under suitable assumptions, reduce asymptotically to the conserved $n - 2$ forms of the linearized theory used in the definition of the boundary charges. As a consequence, Stokes theorem can be used to easily relate the boundary charges to the integral of these $n - 2$ forms on surfaces deep in the bulk, as needs to be done for instance in a derivation of the first law of black hole mechanics.

The standard derivation of the first law is based on Komar integrals [35, 36] (see e.g. [37] for a review). Komar integrals are very useful in this context because they allow one to directly relate integrals defined over the 2 sphere at infinity to integrals defined over the horizon, the bulk contribution that arises in a direct application of Stokes theorem being easily expressible in terms of the energy-momentum tensor. However, the Komar integrals do not provide a complete theory for boundary charges: their normalization has to be fixed by comparing to ADM type expressions and their validity is restricted to the asymptotically flat case.

Systematic Lagrangian approaches to constructing the charges of interacting gauge theories such as general relativity are based on the linearized theory around the background [2, 8, 11]. When applying Stokes theorem directly to the corresponding $n-2$ forms in order to reach surfaces deep in the bulk such as the black hole horizon, one has to take into account the complicated bulk contribution of the non linear part of the field equations that have been shuffled into the right hand side of the equations of motion in the form of an effective energy momentum tensor.

In this paper, we have shown how complicated bulk contributions can be avoided rather easily by a straightforward improvement of the $n-2$ forms constructed in the linearized theory. Furthermore, because the $n-2$ forms constructed here are directly related to the boundary charges for non flat backgrounds, they allow one to generalize the approach of [14, 15, 17, 16] to the first law of black hole mechanics to such more general backgrounds.

In future work, we plan to study general conditions under which the $n - 2$ forms are path independent and apply the formalism to more complicated theories, for instance the higher curvature gravity theories considered in [38, 8, 39, 40], or more exotic black hole solutions involving scalar fields like those discussed in [41, 42].

Acknowledgements

The author wants to thank R. Aros, M. Bañados, X. Bekaert, F. Brandt, C. Chryssomalakos, V. Frolov, M. Henneaux, C. Martínez, R. Olea, R. Troncoso and J. Zanelli for useful discussions. This work is supported in part by the “Ac-

tions de Recherche Concertées” of the “Direction de la Recherche Scientifique-Communauté Française de Belgique, by a “Pôle d’Attraction Interuniversitaire” (Belgium), by IISN-Belgium (convention 4.4505.86), by Proyectos FONDECYT 1970151 and 7960001 (Chile) and by the European Commission RTN programme HPRN-CT00131, in which the author is associated to K. U. Leuven.

Appendix

In the first part of this appendix, we prove theorem 1 and derive sufficient conditions that guarantee that K_f defined by (22) is closed in the bulk. If $\phi_0^i(x) \equiv \bar{\phi}^i(x)$ and $\phi_1^i(x) \equiv \phi^i(x)$ are solutions to the full equations of motion, the last two terms on the right hand side of (23) vanish. Taking into account the explicit expression for the higher order Euler operators, the first term on the right hand side of (23) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_H^n \left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^j} R_\alpha^j(f^\alpha) d^n x \right) = \\ \int_0^1 ds \partial_{(\mu)} \left[\varphi_s^i(x) \binom{|\mu|+1+|\nu|}{|\mu|+1} (-)^{|\nu|} \partial_{(\nu)} \left\{ \frac{\partial^S}{\partial \phi_{(\mu)(\nu)\rho}^i} \left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^j} \right) R_\alpha^j(f^\alpha) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^j} \frac{\partial^S}{\partial \phi_{(\mu)(\nu)\rho}^i} (R_\alpha^j(f^\alpha)) \right\} \right] [\phi_s(x)] (d^{n-1}x)_\rho. \quad (\text{A.1}) \end{aligned}$$

In this equation, a multi-index notation has been used: (μ) stands for $\mu_1 \dots \mu_k$, $|\mu|$ is the length of the multi-index, i.e., if $(\mu) = \mu_1 \dots \mu_k$, $|\mu_1 \dots \mu_k| = k$ and $\partial_{(\mu)} = \partial_{\mu_1} \dots \partial_{\mu_k}$. Furthermore, repeated multi-indices involve sums over both individual indices and the length. The binomial factors in the above expression come from the definition of the higher order Euler operators. The terms in the last line vanish if $\phi_s^i(x)$ is a one parameter family of solutions to the full equations of motion, i.e., if equation (25) holds, whereas the terms in the second line vanish if the (possibly field dependent) gauge parameters are reducibility parameters of this one parameter family of solutions, i.e., $f^\alpha = \tilde{f}^\alpha$ and equation (26) holds. This finishes the proof of theorem 1.

In the second part of the appendix, we will show that

$$I_{\varphi(x)}(S_{\tilde{f}})[\bar{\phi}(x)] = \frac{|\mu|+1}{|\mu|+2} \partial_{(\mu)} \left[\varphi^j(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_{(\mu)\rho}^j} \frac{\partial S_{\tilde{f}}}{\partial d x^\rho} \right] [\bar{\phi}(x)] \quad (\text{A.2})$$

agrees with (18) when the latter is evaluated on solutions $\varphi^i(x)$ of the linearized theory. The only terms that will contribute to $K_{\tilde{f}}$ are those for which the derivatives with respect to the fields of the higher order Euler operators act on $\partial_{(\lambda)} \frac{\delta L}{\delta \phi^i}$ contained in $S_{\tilde{f}}$ because all other terms will vanish when evaluated on solutions ϕ_s^i of the equations of motion. Taking into account that

$$L^{\text{free}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \phi_{(\sigma)}^i \partial \phi_{(\tau)}^j} [\bar{\phi}(x)] \partial_{(\sigma)} \varphi^i \partial_{(\tau)} \varphi^j, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

(A.2) agrees with (18) evaluated at $\bar{\phi}^i(x)$ because

$$\left(\frac{\partial^S}{\partial \phi_{(\nu)}^j} (-\partial)_{(\sigma)} \frac{\partial^S L}{\partial \phi_{(\sigma)}^i} \right) [\bar{\phi}(x)] = \frac{\partial^S}{\partial \varphi_{(\nu)}^j} (-\partial)_{(\sigma)} \left(\frac{\partial^{S^2} L}{\partial \phi_{(\sigma)}^i \partial \phi_{(\tau)}^j} [\bar{\phi}(x)] \partial_{(\tau)} \varphi^j \right). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Furthermore, if $\phi_s^i(x)$ is a one parameter family of solutions to the full equations of motion, $\varphi^i(x)$ is a solution to the linear equations of motion defined by L^{free} . This can be verified by differentiating (25) with respect to s and putting s to zero.

References

- [1] C. Misner, K. Thorne, and J. Wheeler, *Gravitation*. W.H. Freeman, New York, 1973.
- [2] L. F. Abbott and S. Deser, “Stability of gravity with a cosmological constant,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B195** (1982) 76.
- [3] L. F. Abbott and S. Deser, “Charge definition in nonabelian gauge theories,” *Phys. Lett.* **B116** (1982) 259.
- [4] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, “Coordinate invariance and energy expressions in general relativity,” *Phys. Rev.* **122** (1961) 997–1006.
- [5] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, “Role of surface integrals in the Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity,” *Ann. Phys.* **88** (1974) 286.
- [6] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, “Local BRST cohomology in the antifield formalism. I. General theorems,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **174** (1995) 57–92, [hep-th/9405109](#).
- [7] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux, “Local BRST cohomology in gauge theories,” *Phys. Rept.* **338** (2000) 439–569, [hep-th/0002245](#).
- [8] I. M. Anderson and C. G. Torre, “Asymptotic conservation laws in field theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** (1996) 4109–4113, [hep-th/9608008](#).
- [9] C. G. Torre, “Local cohomology in field theory with applications to the Einstein equations,” [hep-th/9706092](#). Lectures given at 2nd Mexican School on Gravitation and Mathematical Physics, Tlaxcala, Mexico, 1-7 Dec 1996.
- [10] N. Boulanger, T. Damour, L. Gualtieri, and M. Henneaux, “Inconsistency of interacting, multigraviton theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B597** (2001) 127–171, [hep-th/0007220](#).
- [11] G. Barnich and F. Brandt, “Covariant theory of asymptotic symmetries, conservation laws and central charges,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B633** (2002) 3–82, [hep-th/0111246](#).

- [12] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *The classical theory of fields*. Pergamon Press, London, 1962.
- [13] D. Bak, D. Cangemi, and R. Jackiw, “Energy - momentum conservation in gravity theories,” *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) 5173–5181.
- [14] R. M. Wald, “Black hole entropy is Noether charge,” *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 3427–3431, [gr-qc/9307038](#).
- [15] V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, “Some properties of Noether charge and a proposal for dynamical black hole entropy,” *Phys. Rev.* **D50** (1994) 846–864, [gr-qc/9403028](#).
- [16] V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, “A comparison of Noether charge and Euclidean methods for computing the entropy of stationary black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 4430–4439, [gr-qc/9503052](#).
- [17] T. Jacobson, G. Kang, and R. C. Myers, “On black hole entropy,” *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) 6587–6598, [gr-qc/9312023](#).
- [18] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*. Princeton University Press, 1992.
- [19] A. Vinogradov, “On the algebra-geometric foundations of Lagrangian field theory,” *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **18** (1977) 1200.
- [20] F. Takens, “A global version of the inverse problem to the calculus of variations,” *J. Diff. Geom.* **14** (1979) 543.
- [21] W. Tulczyjew, “The Euler-Lagrange resolution,” *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **836** (1980) 22.
- [22] I. Anderson and T. Duchamp, “On the existence of global variational principles,” *Amer. J. Math.* **102** (1980) 781.
- [23] M. D. Wilde, “On the local Chevalley cohomology of the dynamical Lie algebra of a symplectic manifold,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **5** (1981) 351.
- [24] T. Tsujishita, “On variational bicomplexes associated to differential equations,” *Osaka J. Math.* **19** (1982) 311.
- [25] F. Brandt, N. Dragon, and M. Kreuzer, “Completeness and nontriviality of the solutions of the consistency conditions,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B332** (1990) 224–249.
- [26] M. Dubois-Violette, M. Henneaux, M. Talon, and C.-M. Viallet, “Some results on local cohomologies in field theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **B267** (1991) 81–87.
- [27] L. Dickey, “On exactness of the variational bicomplex,” *Cont. Math.* **132** (1992) 307.

- [28] N. Dragon, “BRS symmetry and cohomology,” **hep-th/9602163**.
- [29] R. Wald, “On identically closed forms locally constructed from a field,” *J. Math. Phys.* **31** (1990) 2378.
- [30] P. Olver, *Applications of Lie Groups to Differential Equations*. Springer Verlag, New York, 2nd ed., 1993. 1st ed., 1986.
- [31] I. Anderson, “The variational bicomplex,” tech. rep., Formal Geometry and Mathematical Physics, Department of Mathematics, Utah State University, 1989.
http://www.math.usu.edu/fg_mp/Pages/Publications/Publications.html.
- [32] B. Carter, “Hamilton-Jacobi and Schrodinger separable solutions of Einstein’s equations,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **10** (1968) 280.
- [33] M. M. Caldarelli, G. Cognola, and D. Klemm, “Thermodynamics of Kerr-Newman-AdS black holes and conformal field theories,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** (2000) 399–420, **hep-th/9908022**.
- [34] S. Silva, “Black hole entropy and thermodynamics from symmetries,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) 3947–3962, **hep-th/0204179**.
- [35] J. M. Bardeen, B. Carter, and S. W. Hawking, “The four laws of black hole mechanics,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31** (1973) 161–170.
- [36] B. Carter, *Black holes*, ch. Black hole equilibrium states, pp. 58–214. 1972 Les Houches Lectures. Gordon and Breach, New York, C. and B. DeWitt ed., 1973.
- [37] P. K. Townsend, “Black holes,” **gr-qc/9707012**.
- [38] T. Jacobson and R. C. Myers, “Black hole entropy and higher curvature interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 3684–3687, **hep-th/9305016**.
- [39] S. Deser and B. Tekin, “Gravitational energy in quadratic curvature gravities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 101101, **hep-th/0205318**.
- [40] S. Deser and B. Tekin, “Energy in generic higher curvature gravity theories,” **hep-th/0212292**.
- [41] M. Henneaux, C. Martínez, R. Troncoso, and J. Zanelli, “Black holes and asymptotics of 2+1 gravity coupled to a scalar field,” *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 104007, **hep-th/0201170**.
- [42] C. Martínez, R. Troncoso, and J. Zanelli, “De Sitter black hole with a conformally coupled scalar field in four dimensions,” *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 024008, **hep-th/0205319**.